

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q77712

Takeo SEINO, et al.

Appln. No.: 10/669,638

Group Art Unit: 2853

Confirmation No.: 4469

Examiner: Rene GARCIA JR

Filed: September 25, 2003

For: LIQUID CONTAINER FOR A LIQUID EJECTION DEVICE WITH A VIBRATION SENSOR FOR INK LEVEL DETECTION

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

ATTN: MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant makes the following comments on the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The Examiner's description of the claimed features is inaccurate as it fails to recite the language of the various claims. The claims are carefully written to precisely define the bounds of the invention, and people reading these remarks hereafter should note that any difference between the Examiner's language and the language of the claims should be resolved by recourse to only the express language of the claims.

Furthermore, the Examiner's statement should not be misinterpreted as meaning that the identified features are the only patentable feature in any of the claims. The independent claims and the dependent claims include various aspects which provide a separate basis for

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE
U.S. Appln. No. 10/669,638

patentability. The Examiner's statement emphasizes certain aspects of the claims, but each claim should be interpreted using its own precise language, without inferring any particular emphasis from the Examiner's statement.

Patent Office personnel are requested to note that the present submission does not adversely affect the patent term adjustment accrued by Applicant to date. As emphasized in the "Clarification of 37 C.F.R. §1.704(c)(10) – Reduction of Patent Term Adjustment for Certain Types of Papers Filed After a Notice of Allowance Has Been Mailed," 1247OG111 (6/26/01), "a response to the examiner's reasons for allowance" is an example of a paper that does "not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process" and is "not considered a 'failure to engage in reasonable efforts' to conclude processing or examination of the application." Therefore, the Applicant remains entitled to the full patent term adjustment set forth on page 3 of the Notice of Allowance mailed November 3, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,


Natalya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 30, 2006